UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/496,009	02/01/2000	Raymond W. Ellis	ASTGP123	5583

25920   7590   07/25/2008
MARTINE PENILLA & GENCARELLA, LLP
710 LAKEWAY DRIVE
SUITE 200
SUNNYVALE, CA 94085

EXAMINER
BENGZON, GREG C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2144	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/25/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _05/05/2008_.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1,4-6,8-15,18-26,39-42,45,47 and 48_ is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) _1, 4-6, 8-15, 18-26, 39-42, 45,47-48_ is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6)☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

This application has been examined. Claims 1, 4-6, 8-15, 18-26, 39-42, 45,47-48

are pending. Claims 2, 3, 7,16-17, 23-38, 43,44,46 are cancelled.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this

application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action

has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on

05/05/2008 has been entered.

Priority

The effective date of the claims described in this application is February 1, 2000.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and

the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 4-6, 8-15, 18-26, 39-42, 45,47-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rangachari et al. (US Patent 6470227), in view of Tadokoro et al. (US 6463352), further in view of Tenney et al. (US Patent 6944584) further in view of Haverstock (US Patent 6192415).

Rangachari disclosed (re. Claim 1) receiving a first request from the remote client system via the network; (see Rangachari, Col. 8, lines 43-46, Col. 9, lines 22-42, Col. 10, lines 45-51)

determining *a function to be performed* (see Rangachari, Col. 10, lines 52-64, Column 14 Lines 25-35) based at least in part on a first predetermined field contained in said first request; and

sending a first message to the tool in response to said first request and said first type, wherein said first message is operable for controlling an action of said tool (see Rangachari, Col. 6, lines 26-51, Col. 7, lines 20-24 and Col. 8, lines 17-20)

However Rangachari did not disclose (re. Claim 1) using a first predetermined field in a portion of said first request.

While Rangachari disclosed a user interface that a user manipulates for automated control of the devices (Rangachari- Column 9 Lines 33-40, Column 10 Lines

35-60) via the Internet (Rangachari-Column 6 Lines 20-25), Rangachari did not

disclose utilizing a Web browser.

Rangachari did not disclose (re. claim 1) *a uniform resource locator path*

including a function field and an object field and determining a function to be performed

based on said function field in said uniform resource locator path.

Tadokoro disclosed (re. Claim 1) using a first predetermined field in a portion of

said first request.   See Tadokoro, Col. 10, lines 1-25.

Rangachari and Tadokoro are analogous art because they present concepts and

practices regarding distributed software components for controlling machines remotely

via a network.   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the networking art

at the time the invention was made to have incorporated Tadokoro's teachings of a

system for controlling software components for machines in a distributed manner with

the teachings of Rangachari, for the purpose of improving workflow efficiency of a

system by better monitoring processes, thereby preventing bottlenecks (see Tadokoro,

Col. 2, lines 10-25).

Tenney disclosed (re. Claim 1) using a Web browser for controlling motions of

devices. (Tenney-Column 6 Lines 55-65)

Haverstock disclosed (re. Claim 1) a server to respond to a URL requests

containing action commands from a browser. Action commands and additional

arguments are input into the URL. The server receives the request for the URL and

processes the actions and arguments identified in the URL. (Haverstock-Column 3

Lines 10-20, Column 5 Lines 20-35) Thus Haverstock disclosed (re. Claim 1) *a uniform*

resource locator path including a function field and an object field and determining a

function to be performed based on said function field in said uniform resource locator

path.

Rangachari, Tadokoro, Tenney, and Haverstock are analogous art because they

present concepts and practices regarding distributed software components for

controlling machines remotely via a network.   It would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the networking art at the time the invention was made to have

incorporated Tenney's teachings of a system for controlling software components for

machines in a distributed manner with the teachings of Rangachari-Tadokoro, for the

purpose of using non-proprietary network protocols for simplified network

communications (Tenney-Column 2 Lines 10-15). Similarly it would have been obvious

to one of ordinary skill in the networking art at the time the invention was made to have

incorporated Haverstock's teachings of a URL with action commands into Rangachari-

Tadokoro-Tenney-Haverstock for the purpose of allowing system users to retrieve

objects and identify actions with a single input command without requiring programming

code. (Haverstock-Column 5 Lines 40-45)

Rangachari-Tadokoro-Tenney-Haverstock disclosed (re. Claim 4) wherein said

tools return at least one second message associated with said first action, said method

further comprising the step of caching said at least one second message (see

Rangachari, Col. 13, lines 50-64, Column 15 Lines 10 and Tadokoro, Col. 13, lines 12-

28).

Rangachari-Tadokoro-Tenney-Haverstock disclosed (re. Claim 5)   receiving a

second request and generating a response to the second request using said second

message (Rangachari teaches that methods are invoked between application objects

and servers to perform specific tasks outlined within a message), (see Rangachari, Col.

10, lines 52-64, Figure 1J).

Rangachari-Tadokoro-Tenney-Haverstock disclosed (re. Claim 6)   the step of

sending said response to a client system initiating said first and second requests

(Rangachari teaches that the client is notified of the completion of a task along with any

attributes that are need), see Rangachari, Col. 10, lines 64-67, Col. 11, lines 1-3.

Rangachari-Tadokoro-Tenney-Haverstock disclosed (re. Claim 8) receiving a

connection request and opening a connection to a client, said connection being

operable for communicating requests and responses to said requests (Tadokoro

teaches HTTP requests), (see Tadokoro, Col. 12, lines 43-45).

Rangachari-Tadokoro-Tenney-Haverstock disclosed (re. Claim 9)   receiving a

second request from said client system via said network (see rejection of claim 1 ,

supra), said second request selected from the group consisting of information requests,

expand requests and edit requests (see Tadokoro, Figures 10-14), wherein, in response

to said information requests, an HTML page is generated using a set of selected data

for a tool object corresponding to a managed tool for sending to said client system, as

well as in response to said edit requests, an HTML page is generated having a portion

operable for user entry of one or more values for modifying a tool object attribute for

sending to said client system and in response to said expand request an HTML page is

generated using a set of child object names and relations to a parent object identified in

said expand request for sending to said client (Tadokoro, Col. 8, lines 10-37, Col. 9,

lines 1-9, Col. 12, lines 21-44).

Rangachari-Tadokoro-Tenney-Haverstock disclosed (re. Claim 10)   wherein

said first request denotes an execute request (see Rangachari, Col. 10, lines 52-64).

Rangachari-Tadokoro-Tenney-Haverstock disclosed (re. Claim 11,12,13) the limitations of these claims are substantially the same as that of claim 1 , and thus are rejected for the same rationale in rejecting those claims. Furthermore, with regards to the limitations of parsing a script, determining if said script source includes a method signature matching a method signature of said tool object method, and if so, executing a corresponding portion of said script, see Tadokoro, col. 12, lines 21-44 , Rangachari-Column 9 Lines 20, and Tenney-Column 11 Lines 40 'Java Remote Method Invocation protocol') .

Rangachari-Tadokoro-Tenney-Haverstock disclosed (re. Claim 14) wherein said first request is transferred in accordance with the hypertext transfer protocol (HTTP), and said portion corresponds to a uniform resource locator (see Tadokoro, Col. 10, lines 1-47).

Claims 15, 18-26, 41-42, and 45 present a data processing system with the same limitations as Claims 1, 4-6, 8-14, and 39-40.

Claims 15, 18-26, 41-42, and 45 are rejected on the same basis as Claims 1, 4-6, 8-14, and 39-40.

Rangachari-Tadokoro-Tenney-Haverstock disclosed (re. Claim 47,48)   wherein

said first network and said second network utilize the same local area network.

(Tenney-Figure 9 Column 11 Lines 5-25)

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 05/05/2008 have been considered but are moot in

view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

The Applicant presents the following argument(s) [in italics]:

Rangachari does not teach or suggest "receiving a first request from the remote

client system via the first network."

The Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicant.

Rangachari disclosed a user interface that a user manipulates for automated control

of the devices (Rangachari- Column 9 Lines 33-40, Column 10 Lines 35-60) via the

Internet (Rangachari-Column 6 Lines 20-25)

Rangachari disclosed that the GUI stations on a display client (Column 14 Lines 20-

25) may be run on separate computer systems,(Column 14 Lines 50-60) and that

program instructions may be communicated via the Internet. (Column 6 Lines 20-

25). Given this disclosure it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in

the networking art to implement the GUI stations as a remote client and enabling the

operator at the GUI station to send commands via the network.

Tenney has overlapping disclosure regarding this claimed invention. Tenney

disclosed *'running a Web browser over a network to operate a tool'.* (Tenney-Column 6

Lines 55-65, Column 5 Lines 30-45).

The Applicant presents the following argument(s) [in italics]:

Tadokoro discloses that the unique IP address referred to by the Examiner is

associated with a virtual machine object 5 (see Fig. 2a-2b). Tadokoro teaches that

each virtual machine object 5 is connected to a single tool. Thus, the virtual machine

object cannot comprise "a tool server ...

The Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicant.

While Tadokoro describes each virtual machine object as a single tool, the

Examiner notes that it would have been an obvious variation of Tadokoro to view the

plurality of virtual machine objects as a collection of objects, said collection being

equivalent to a tool server serving a plurality of tools.

Further, in response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references.

Tadokoro is not relied upon to disclose a tool server. Rangachari disclosed a tool server (Rangachari-Column 7 Lines 30-45). Similarly Tenney also disclosed a tool server (Tenney-Column 5 Lines 30-40). Both Rangachari and Tenney disclosed said tool servers that are able to accept requests via the Internet. It would be obvious to a person ordinary skill in the networking art that the tool servers by Rangachari and Tenney are inter-changeable with the virtual machine object by Tadokoro.

The Examiner notes that the method step of including control information and context information in an HTTP request, wherein control/context information specifies a function to be performed, is well-known in the networking art.

Given Tenney's disclosure to use well-known data exchange protocols (Tenney-Column 6 Lines 40-60) via a web browser it would have been obvious to include control/context information in the request, such as for manually controlling the robot motions. (Tenney-Column 7 Lines 50-60)

Tadokoro disclosed several input control fields (Tadokoro-Column 26 Lines 50-65) indicating a machine function that may be input from the operator browser (Tadokoro-Column 9 Lines 10-25).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the networking art to determine the function being requested by parsing the data structure of the HTTP request.

Conclusion

Examiner's Note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

In the case of amending the claimed invention, Applicant is respectfully requested to indicate the portion(s) of the specification which dictate(s) the structure relied on for proper interpretation and also to verify and ascertain the metes and bounds of the claimed invention.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Greg Bengzon whose telephone number is (571) 272-3944. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. thru Fri. 8 AM - 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Vaughn can be reached on (571)272-3922. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/G. B./
Examiner, Art Unit 2144

/Paul H Kang/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2144

Application Number	Application/Control No.	Applicant(s)/Patent under Reexamination
	09/496,009	ELLIS ET AL.
	Examiner	**Art Unit**
	GREG BENGZON	2144